DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 472 899 IR 058 604

AUTHOR	Swanson, Edward
TITLE	Editing ISBD(CR): Approach, Scope, Definitions.
PUB DATE	2002-08-00
NOTE	6p.; In: Libraries for Life: Democracy, Diversity, Delivery. IFLA Council and General Conference: Conference Programme and Proceedings (68th, Glasgow, Scotland, August 18-24, 2002); see IR 058 549.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.ifla.org.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Information Industry; Information Management; Information Sources; *Serials; Standard Setting; *Standards
IDENTIFIERS	*International Standard Bibliographic Description; *International Standard Serial Number; International Standards

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the background of the development of the International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials and Other Continuing Resources, or ISBD(CR). Discussion includes: formation of a working group in 1997 to look at the existing ISBD and objectives of the project; the first official meeting of the working group in August 1998 (which discussed key title issues, the question of major versus minor changes in title, and the need to determine which issue was to be used as the source of description and how to deal with works that appear in multiple manifestations); the meeting in November 1998 (which discussed objectives of the ISBD(S) standard, the definition of "serial," and the decision that it was preferable to have a separate ISSN and record for each physical form of a title that appeared in multiple formats); the meeting in January 2000 (which reviewed what was happing with regard to the ISSN community and serial cataloging, reviewed the scope of the revised ISBD, discussed the title of the standard, reviewed the definition of "serial," and discussed the proposed International Benchmark Title); the "Meeting of Experts" at the Library of Congress in November 2000 (which agreed on several definitions, made final decisions about major/minor changes); completion of a final draft of the ISBD (CR) document, its posting to IFLANET in the spring of 2001, and comments raised about it; editorial work on the standard and preparation of examples, completed in fall of 2001; what was accomplished, and what is left to do. (AEF)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

IFLA GLASGOW 2002

68th IFLA Council and General Conference August 18-24, 2002

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Koopman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Code Number: 148-162(WS)-E
Division Number: IV
Professional Group: Cataloguing with Serial Publications - Workshop
Joint Meeting with: -
Meeting Number: 162
Simultaneous Interpretation: -

Editing ISBD(CR): approach, scope, definitions

Edward Swanson
Manager, Contract Cataloging Program
MINITEX Library Information Network
Minneapolis, Minnesota USA

ED 472 899

My responsibility on today's program is to give the background of the development of the International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials and Other Continuing Resources or ISBD(CR).

At the 1997 IFLA Conference in Copenhagen, the IFLA Section on Cataloguing decided to form a working group to look at the existing second edition of the International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials to see what sorts of changes might be made to it, particularly in the light of other developments taking place in the serials and cataloging communities.

The objectives of the project included:
(1) to reflect consideration of pertinent recommendations of the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records Study Group and pertinent provisions of the ISBD for Electronic Resources approved in 1997;
(2) to set forth and reflect contemporaneous definition and theory of seriality, taking into account the emergence of ongoing electronic publications;
(3) to reconsider the propriety of basing the bibliographic description of serials on the first issue to be published, and the concept of "chief source" for serials;
(4) to consider areas of the description in which identification of data may be more desirable than transcription;
(5) to take into account the emergence of metadata standards and proposals that have been developed to provide a basic level of access to and description of remote electronic resources;
(6) to provide new and updated examples;
(7) to consider the suggestions of serials experts, both individuals and organizations; and,

IR058604

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(8) to achieve harmonization with the draft standard of the ISSN manual, including ISO standard 3297, and to take into consideration developing ISSN network practices for electronic publications.

Appointed to the working group were Ingrid Parent as chair, Paul Bunn, Zlata Dimec, Ton Heijligers, John Byrum, Dorothy McGarry, Ljudmila Terekhova, and Reinhard Rinn from the IFLA Section on Cataloguing, Elise Hermann from the IFLA Section on Serial Publications, Alain Roucolle from the International ISSN Centre, and me as editor. During the work of the group, Karen Darling replaced Elise Hermann and Alex Bloss was added as a member.

In addition to these members, a number of others were appointed as resource persons and corresponding members, among them Jean-Arthur Creff, Unni Knutsen, Jean Hirons, Regina Reynolds, Judith Kuhagen, and Françoise Pellé.

In April of 1998 a preliminary planning meeting was held at Die Deutsche Bibliothek in Frankfurt. No real work on the standard was done at this meeting, because only four members of the working group were present, but they did review the charge to the group, the list of resource persons and corresponding members was discussed, and it was decided to establish an electronic mailing list for the working group, which ultimately served as the main mechanism for discussions by the group.

The working group held its first official meeting during the IFLA General Conference in Amsterdam in August 1998.

The major issues discussed at this meeting included, first, key title issues. It was felt that the problems with key titles were the same as they had been 20 years earlier, namely the difference between description and identification. It was felt that what needs to be done is to define a unique title that defines what a particular work is, so that an identical identification of what is being cataloged can be achieved. The question for the working group is which title is this unique title?

Second, the working group discussed the question of major versus minor changes in title, and decided that the new ISBD should redefine those conditions under which a title is considered to have changed. Third, a brief discussion was held on electronic databases and Web sites, the result being that if the group decided to include these types of material in the ISBD, the definition of serial would need to be reworked.

The final topics that were discussed were the need to determine exactly which issue is to be used as the source of the description, the existing ISBD(S) being less restrictive than the national cataloging codes tend to be, and how to deal with works that appear in multiple manifestations.

In anticipation of the group's next meeting, which was scheduled to be held in Copenhagen in November 1998, assignments were made to prepare position papers on a variety of topics, including the scope of the ISBD(S), the definition of a serial, the sources of description, changes requiring new records, creation of records for manifestations of works, identification versus transcription, and relationship of title practice between ISBD(S) and ISSN.

Also present at this meeting was Judith Szilvássy, who had chaired the working group that produced the second edition of ISBD(S). She spoke about the work of that group, including its attempt at trying to merge the title proper and the key title and other problems that they had faced during their work.

The Copenhagen meeting, held November 23 and 24, 1998, began with a discussion of the objectives of the ISBD(S) standard, in other words, what does the standard do, why is it being revised, and whom does it serve?

The meeting then turned to a discussion of the submitted papers. The paper dealing with the scope of the ISBD(S) recommended that the standard be expanded to encompass traditional serials as well as serial-like or ongoing entities such as loose-leaf services and databases. It was pointed out that if this

was decided upon, new definitions would need to be worked out and it might be necessary to have two sets of rules. The group agreed that the scope of ISBD(S) needed to be expanded to include these additional types of materials.

The definition of "serial" was discussed next. The working definition that was decided upon was, "a bibliographic resource in any medium that is usually intended to be continued indefinitely. Serials include: 1) resources, often bearing numeric and/or chronological designation, that are issued in successive parts (e.g., periodicals, newspapers, annual reports, almanacs, monographic series, newsletters of an event, etc.); 2) single cumulative resources that are updated or added to (e.g., databases, Web pages, loose-leaf services, etc.)." The following speakers will discuss this definition in more detail.

Recommendations adopted on the basis of the position paper on sources for description included (1) the use of the first available issue as the basis for the description when the first issue is not available; and, (2) expanding the list of chief sources of information to accord with the list in AACR 2. Two other proposals were not agreed to: first, no decision was taken on the proposal to change the title proper in the description when a minor change in title occurs; and, second, how to deal with the later publication details when the place or publisher changes. Four positions were discussed: (1) leave the earliest information in area 4; (2) provide sequential places and publishers in area 4; (3) change to the latest information in area 4; (4) no opinion. The group was quite evenly divided between options 1 and 3, so it was decided that no final decision would be made at this point.

Several proposals for major and minor changes were discussed. Although several of these were agreed to, it was decided that consultation with the ISSN group and the Joint Steering Committee was necessary before coming up with the final list.

The working group decided that their preference would be for a separate ISSN and record for each physical form of a title that appeared in multiple formats.

The next major meeting was held in San Antonio, Texas, USA, in January 2000, immediately preceding the American Library Association Midwinter Meeting. The meeting began with a review of what was happening in the ISSN community and in the Joint Steering Committee with regard to serials cataloging.

Following on this the Working Group reviewed a series of position papers prepared by the Editor. The first dealt with the scope of the revised ISBD. The Working Group agreed to the proposals included in the position paper on scope, namely that it be expanded to include all types of continuing publications, that it incorporate the concept that seriality is a condition of publication, not a form of material, that examples be included from all types of materials, and that, as appropriate, special rules that have application to only one type of continuing publication be included with the general rules for that particular area of the description (e.g., the special rules for recording the title proper of a loose-leaf publication be included with the general rules in the title and statement of responsibility area).

A related decision taken at this meeting concerned the title of the standard. It was felt that the new title needed to reflect the fact that more than just serials were included, but at the same time provide a link with the previous standard, so it was decided to use International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials and Other Continuing Resources. This led to a discussion about the abbreviated form, and ISBD(CR) was decided upon, the members feeling ISBD(SOCR) was not quite appropriate.

The Working Group reviewed its definition of serial to more closely align it with that used by ISSN and the JSC and also discussed definitions for "bibliographic resource", "continuing resource", and "integrating resource".

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A decision on the use of the first issue versus the latest issue was postponed pending additional discussion at the Joint Steering Committee. A substantial portion of the meeting time was spent discussing major and minor changes. Working from the idea that the ISBD(S) defined major changes as any changes to the title proper "that are not minor", the group developed a list of the types of changes that should be considered to be minor, from which listing another listing of major changes could be developed.

A document received from the Dutch Cataloguing Committee was discussed. Of particular interest were their comments on the edition area, but no further action on this topic was taken.

The final major discussion at this meeting related to the proposed International Benchmark Title, which is a part of a package including decisions on major and minor changes, first versus latest issue cataloging, and changes in area 4. The consensus was that such a proposed title, against which title changes could be checked to see if they constitute major or minor changes, was important. After much discussion it was decided to try to put together a pilot project to see how such a title would work, its relationship to the key title, use of corporate body names as qualifiers, changes to publisher and place of publication, etc.

A key step in arriving at the final form of ISBD(CR) was the so-called Meeting of Experts held at the Library of Congress in November of 2000. At this meeting 16 individuals, representing the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, the ISSN Community, and the ISBD(S) Working Group met to try to harmonize the decisions about several of the main topics each was considering in its current revision work.

The group agreed on definitions for "continuing resource", "integrating resource", "serial", "updating loose-leaf", and "numbering" for use by all three groups. In addition, time was spent discussing successive versus latest entry.

Final decisions were made of the types of changes that would constitute major changes and those that would constitute minor changes. Issues relating to title transcription included a decision to follow ISSN practice of choosing the full form when both the full form and an acronym or initialism appear in the chief source of information. Also agreed to was the policy of omitting from the title proper dates, names, numbers, etc., that vary from issue to issue. Other topics included the omission from the title of words that link the title to the designation, the choice of title proper when there are multiple titles in different languages, and common title/section title and series/subseries.

The question on changes in the publisher statement was raised. The group felt that more consultation was needed and that it was too early to take a decision at this point.

With regard to the International Standard Serials Title, it was agreed that a coordinating group would be set up under the direction of ISSN to study this.

Areas needing harmonization that were not addressed included romanization schemes, the edition statement and dependent title questions, and the possibility of return to latest entry cataloging. With regard to the last, point it was felt that this should be deferred until we have some experience with latest entry cataloging for integrating resources.

Following up on the Meeting of Experts and reactions to its decisions by members of the Working Group, a final draft of the ISBD(CR) document was completed. This was distributed to the Working Group for their review and comments, from which the proposed final text of the draft standard of ISBD(CR) was created.

In the spring of 2001, this draft standard was posted to IFLANET for worldwide review. Comments were received from some seven national committees, seven national libraries, the International ISSN Centre and one national ISSN centre, and four individuals.

The comments ranged in length from less than one page to a rule-by-rule analysis of the entire document. Each of these comments was reviewed to determine how it should be reacted to. In many cases the comments reflected items that had been discussed by the working group and either specifically incorporated into the text or explicitly rejected. Following this the text was reviewed in depth by Jim Cole, an expert in serial cataloging who had not been involved in the process of developing the standard, to give a fresh perspective to the document from the point of view of the user. A number of comments raised in the two review processes were distributed for resolution to the members of the working group by e-mail or at the final meeting of the group in Boston during the 2001 IFLA Conference.

Editorial work on the standard and the preparation of examples was completed during the autumn of 2001. During this time the draft standard also was examined for consistency with the ISBD(M) and to see how it relates to the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records. The final version was distributed first to the members of the Working Group for any final comments, following which it was distributed to the members of the standing committees of the IFLA Section on Cataloguing and the IFLA Section on Serial Publications for vote. On June 17 it was announced that the standard had been approved.

What did we accomplish? First of all, there now exists a standard that provides rules for dealing both with traditional serials in print and other formats and with those works that display serial-like qualities, such as loose-leaf publications and Web sites. Second, we have a standard that is in harmony with two other major international standards, the ISSN manual and AACR 2.

What is left to do? The work of the ISBD(S) Working group left some questions unanswered. One is how to deal efficiently with a sequence of publishers and/or places of publication. Another is the whole question of editions and edition statements. The question of a return to latest title cataloging still exists, as does the idea of establishing an International Standard Serial Title as a benchmark for title changes and linking purposes. Undoubtedly there are situations that will arise during the application of ISBD(CR) in real life that will require fine-tuning, and future technological developments may also have an effect on the rules.

The preparation of the second edition of ISBD(S) took seven years. The work to produce ISBD(CR) took just over four years from the time work actually began until it was available in the printed version.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

X	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").